Vol. IX, No. 43 HUMAN EVENTS October 22, 1952

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA RECEIVED OCT 30 '52 LIBRARY

GOOD MORNING, MR. STEVENSON

By FELIX WITTMER

HAVING ATTENDED Princeton, Harvard and Northwestern, dear Governor, you should be acquainted with the fundamentals of our form of government. However, in view of certain statements you have made during the present campaign, and more particularly because of the character of your support, it seems necessary to call your attention to these fundamentals.

In the first place, the Founding Fathers knew well that the individual, who hadn't had much experience in freedom during the eons he had inhabited the earth, would suffocate in any Utopian direct democracy. Therefore, they adopted the checks-and-balances system of representative government, incorporating it in the Constitution of the United States. Though the socialists are wont to call this document outdated, the fact is that, in view of the many centuries of authoritarianism which preceded its adoption, it is a most modern masterwork. Under that Constitution we Americans have enjoyed more freedom than the peoples of the world had ever known.

For one thing, we have not had any so-called workers' party which, through the unscrupulous exploitation of the mass vote, organizes systematic robbery in the guise of the welfare state. There was one attempt at a labor party in America — Senator Robert M. LaFollette's Progressive Party of 1924. It obtained less than five million votes and disappeared. Only when Franklin Delano Roosevelt, eager to prolong his reign, encouraged the organization of the CIO and its Communist-directed Political Action Committee, was America put on the way to political socialism.

Within a few years, the Democratic Party became the captive of the socialists. Roosevelt in 1944 and Truman in 1948 won the elections with the backing of organized labor. What is left of the Democratic Party is mostly the name. The Democratic Party is now in reality the Socialist Party of America.

The same forces of mass tyranization which have brought impoverishment, fear and despair to once hopeful and glorious Europe now threaten to engulf us. The rise of the tyrannical masses — through the ascendance of your party — may be the death signal for our Constitution, with its guarantees of individual freedom.

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM, setting class against class, comes to us from Europe, now the Continent of frenzied strife and despair. Europe had an International Workingmen's Association as early as 1864. The Germans founded a Social Democratic (i.e., Socialistic) Labor Party as early as 1869. The French established the (socialist) Worker's Party around 1875. The endeavors of the British socialists led to the Independent Labor Party of 1893 and the Labor Party of 1906.

Both the CIO and AFL, as of today, are not designed to represent the workingmen for the purpose of bargaining and obtaining more suitable working conditions. They are political machines, run on the principles of totalitarian dictatorships and aiming to obliterate our free enterprise system and destroy our constitutional immunities.

Both coalitions of our labor unions are guided by Marxian Politburos: The CIO by the Political Action Committee and the AFL by the Labor's League for Political Education. While the CIO has been more of the revolutionary type and the AFL never of the Fabian or reformist undermining variety, both of them, through PAC and LLPE, aim at establishing the proletarian class dictatorship. If either prevails, a dictatorship of labor leaders would replace our republican form of government.

Roosevelt's attempt to pack the Supreme Court was a brazen, cynical and shameless expression of disregard for America's most cherished possession. Truman's recent seizure of the steel plants and his refusal to be guided by the law which Congress had established reveal him as equally unworthy of our heritage.

Political immorality is by now so widespread that the two politicians who had been in the White House for the past two decades, in the cases mentioned, were not even aware of the responsibilities which our Constitution had placed on them. Nor did they feel inhibited by its provision for the safeguarding of private property. It suited their ambitions to call upon the intellectual collectivists to help them manage the nation's economy, and the collectivists, following the Marxian pattern they had learned at college, attacked American business with whole panzer divisions of regulations, economic strangulations and expropriations.

As a result of a sequence of reckless experiments in socialism we are now saddled with close to 300 billion dollars of debt, and our dollar buys but half of what it bought in 1939. The Administrations of Roosevelt and Truman conveniently forgot that government money is the people's money. They certainly forgot that businessmen, too, are people. Rob the enterprising and give the loot to the voters, that is the philosophy of the Roosevelt and Truman Administrations.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Roosevelt and Truman thus followed the un-American dictum of Karl Marx, "From each according to his ability to each according to his need." They thus went the Lord one better, for Christ said, "Who made me a divider over you? And He said unto them, Take heed and beware of covetousness; for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." (Luke: 12:14:15.)

FOR THE FIRST TIME in American history, Governor, organized labor officially backs one of the two principal Presidential candidates. Organized labor now is virtually a labor party. You, Mr. Stevenson, are the official choice both of the CIO and AFL. You are the choice not of the individual workers, but of the political revolutionaries who dominate our working men in approved totalitarian fashion. If our working men knew that the socialism of their masters must, by the strangulation of enterprise, lead to their own impoverishment, you could not count on this support.

If it were still a custom to call a spade a spade, you, Governor, would come out straight and say, "I, Adlai Ewing Stevenson, am the Socialist Candidate for the American Presidency. I have denounced the Taft-Hartley Act, which is our first attempt to be fair to both labor and employer; but I have not said what I want to take its place. Considering that the CIO endorsed me even two weeks before my Labor Day speech I give everyone three guesses as to what sort of impartial labor legislation I favor. By supporting compulsory FEPC I advocate additional state control. I, Adlai Ewing Stevenson, have also no criticism of our government deficit spending to offer. Dilution of our currency doesn't bother me. I'm a progressive. I'm a socialist, pure and simple."

Your socialism, Mr. Stevenson, is so close to that of our curious friends of the Soviet Union that you have manifestly fallen for their line. You seem to be well qualified for the role of Soviet fall guy. Any American whose mind has not been poisoned by crypto-Communist news analysts knows that Joe McCarthy is a genuine American, and that the uproar against so-called McCarthyism is a plant of the Soviet agents. But you, Governor, in your Legion speech, and elsewhere, have joined the pinko chorus of the wailing do-gooding fraternity which gets more excited over the McCarthyist "peril" than over the Communist threat to free America.

"If there are Communist teachers", you said in the same speech. Why the "if", Governor? Do you still have any doubt that our school systems, on all levels, are chock full of Commies and fellow-travellers? Don't you know that the Communist Party, itself, in a public report, has boasted of 1,200 dues-paying members who were employed in the school system of the City of New York alone? Do you live in fairyland, Governor?

In your New Jersey speech you praised "the blazing record of growth and change and progress we have written in these two memorable decades". Two weeks later, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

San Francisco, you said that "America is threatened as never before". Isn't the threat to America a direct result of that socialistic, Commie-coddling policy which you have characterized as a "blazing record"? Who delivered Balts, Czechs, Poles, Eastern Germans, Chinese and others — some 600 million people — into the hands of the Soviet barbarians? Did the passing Administration, with which you have identified yourself, have nothing to do with these crimes?

"The people of this country", you said before the Jersey Democrats, "are better off than they . . . have ever been." Have you forgotten our pensioners, the widows and the orphans, or do you exclude them from what you call "the people" because they won't get you enough votes?

Let us be precise, Governor, more precise than you have been in your speeches. Twenty-five years ago the beneficiary of a $100,000 trust fund in U.S. Government bonds had an income of $4,000 per year. These bonds, long since matured, have been replaced by bonds which yield but $2,500 per year. Taxes reduce that income to $2,200. Noting what the dollar was worth at that time and what it buys now, the beneficiary has about $1,250 to spend, instead of the original $4,000. How does that fit into the "blazing record", Governor?

IN THE HISTORICAL perspective, sir, you play a miserable role — as far as freedom goes; for, as the official choice of the CIO and AFL bosses you are an instrument in the hands of those who are destroying western civilization, the first in history which really knew individual freedom. Because through your whole adult life you have been the associate and friend of socialists, Communist-fronters and Communists, you do not see that your blueprints for government control spell the decline and ruin of free America.

Jack Kroll, the mastermind of CIO's Political Action Committee, and Jake Arvey, Chicago's crony of the CIO, actually are your guiding spirits. Wilson Wyatt, bigwig of the socialistic Americans for Democratic Action, and Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., the apologists for Communist fronts, manage your campaign. Leftists like Marshall Field and inveterate joiners of Communist fronts among the Truman darlings like Frank Porter Graham are your closest friends. Ever fearful of the McCarthyist bogey, you even voluntarily testified in behalf of Alger Hiss.

Approved by Acheson and Eleanor Roosevelt, you will, as you proposed in San Francisco, "negotiate" with Eleanor's "Soviet friends". You still don't know that any agreement with the Soviets is not worth the paper on which it is written; for you are that symbol of western decadence, the socialist grave-digger of our Constitution. May the Lord have mercy on America — if you become its President.

Felix Wittmer, formerly on the faculty of State Teachers College in Montclair, N. J., has contributed both to the *American Mercury* and the *Freeman.*

ADDITIONAL COPIES: One—$.20; six—1.00; ten—1.50; fifty—5.50; one hundred—10.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Volume IX, No. 43 Wednesday, October 22, 1952 Washington, D. C.

Operation MacArthur: The attempt to bring about a MacArthur declaration for the Eisenhower candidacy has reached the stage where it is referred to — in high GOP circles — as "Operation MacArthur". After our report on this development last week, other publicists have offered various versions of the matter.

The development of such an operation was inevitable, as HUMAN EVENTS was the first to point out (on September 17). At that time, we said that the then recent Taft announcement of support for Ike was not enough . . . "a fractional, partial, untested thing", giving "courage to the politicos, but leaving the average voter tepid", and Ike "must next win over his old military mentor".

The immediate impetus for the operation is bedded in highly practical voting considerations. While MacArthur has abjured all the movements nominating him for the Presidency and none of these amount to much on a national scale, there is one state, Texas, where his name is on the ballot and where the vote may come to as much as 25,000. In that state, Ike's partisans are putting up a terrific battle, aided by Democratic Governor Shivers and other prominent members of the Democratic Party who oppose "Trumanism". Few venture a positive guess as to the outcome; all agree that if Ike wins, it will be a close victory. Hence, the Ike managers have good reason to seek an endorsement from MacArthur to get a switch of those 25,000 votes.

This explains why, although initial efforts to arrange a "deal" between the two generals have (up to this date of writing) failed, the Ike managers persist in trying. High members of the Republican National Committee, members of Congress and (according to some reports) even ex-President Herbert Hoover, have all sought to interest MacArthur in an endorsement.

One report, circulated by sources long critical of MacArthur, has it that the General laid down one condition — that Eisenhower must make the overture himself, and must call on him in his apartment in the Waldorf; and that Ike has refused to do.

According to our information, this version is incorrect. MacArthur has not laid down any such condition. He has, however, been wearied of calls from various emissaries who wish to "fix things up", and he insists that the only sensible course is to arrange a personal meeting of the two principals. No misunderstanding would be then possible. The locale of such a meeting is of small importance, and there's no question of who calls on whom or where.

One condition reportedly laid down by MacArthur is interesting, although we have been unable to obtain confirmation on it. It is this: that MacArthur will come out for Ike, providing Ike endorses MacArthur's famous keynote speech given at the Republican Convention last July 7. Reportedly Ike has rejected this demand.

Moscow Choice: Experts who study every issue of the *Daily Worker* as it appears say that the Kremlin obviously prefers Stevenson to Eisenhower. That does not mean that the Communist organ, sensitive to the twists and turns directed by the bosses in the Russian capital, has frankly stated its preference nor that it has even praised the Governor of Illinois. The current line is one of official opposition to both "capitalistic" candidates and no deviation is permitted.

However, experts are familiar with the indirect but no less positive indications of preference. The "angle-ing" of news stories, the flavor of headlines and the shading of phrases in editorials — all reveal the true attitude of the Kremlin.

Copyright 1952 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.
Published weekly at 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An analysis of these indices shows that the Kremlin weights the anti-Eisenhower material in the proportion of *six* against Ike to *one* against Stevenson. Hence, the comrades understand just what Moscow wants them to do.

These students of Communist tactics also perceive in Vishinsky's attitude in the current opening of the United Nations Conference in New York a further indication of the Kremlin bias. Although the delegates of non-Soviet nations generally have avoided any statement which might involve the American election, not so with Soviet Russia and its satellites. It was particularly noted that, in the session of October 17, a Polish Communist delegate attacked Eisenhower's speech about freeing satellite countries, and on the 18th Vishinsky sneeringly referred to Ike's "electioneering" tactics. There was no reference at all to Stevenson.

Experts on Soviet tactics believe the Kremlin preference for Stevenson is also — and most importantly — based on the necessities of the "new line" announced by Stalin in his speech of last week. The appearance of this "new line" was forecasted in HUMAN EVENTS on September 17. We said then that the new course would call for collaboration with "bourgeois" elements, and would replace the "revolutionary line", which has shaped Comintern policy since 1946. We recalled that "the same thing took place in 1935 when the Popular Front was started. It was this Popular Front which brought about the fall of France and which enabled the Soviets to carry off the fruits of World War II and its peace settlement of Yalta and Potsdam."

It is glaringly obvious, therefore, that the Kremlin needs a certain type of American executive who will be receptive to the "new line", as Franklin D. Roosevelt welcomed the Popular Front line and its pink protagonists fifteen years ago. And consequently, it seems clear that the one candidate who has shown such extraordinary "innocence" of Soviet tactics is the Democratic candidate. Eisenhower has drawn Communist fire for his statements on Eastern Europe. He will not do. But the man who gave the deposition for Soviet agent Alger Hiss clearly fits the specifications laid down in the Kremlin.

Political Chatter: Senator Byrd in an eloquent speech last Friday denounced Stevenson, but no Democrat read Byrd out of the party. Neither — it is significant to note — did any Democrat dare suggest that Byrd in the next Congress should lose his seniority rights in the Senate. This kind of threat is being uttered with wearisome repetition in the South, by Stevenson supporters.

The reasons for leaving Byrd alone are: (1) He is too prominent and respected a Senator to bully; and (2) he might, in retort, broadcast the truth of which too few Southern members of Congress are mindful, i.e., that the Democrats could not organize Congress without the conservative Southerners. In the Senate, there are 16 staunch conservative Southern Democrats and some 85 similar Representatives in the House. Not since the landslide of 1936 have there been sufficient Northern Democratic members of Congress to organize Congress and ladle out the chairmanships. No such prospect is in view for this year's congressional elections. In short, the Southern conservatives hold the balance of power.

—— Skepticism about the polls prevails in the Capital. Memories of the 1948 surprise outcome linger, and bitterly. Therefore, polls reporting that Stevenson is drawing abreast of Ike inspire remarks about the "hedging" of the pollsters, who wish to have an alibi for the morrow of the election.

—— Former followers of Taft now working zealously for Ike confess that they really do not know through which political leaders Ike will act if he wins the election. Arthur S. Summerfield, friend of the Taft-ites, has won out over other counsellors of the General on a number of matters. But Governor Sherman Adams, darling of the Eastern internationalists, remains the right hand man of the candidate. In short, as one of the ex-Taft workers put it, "Perhaps our fight will only begin the day after Ike wins."

—— Administration sources are already doping the outlines of the cabinet, should Stevenson win, as follows: Averell Harriman for Secretary of State; Beardsley Ruml (author of the withholding tax) for Secretary of the Treasury; Wilson Wyatt, Attorney General; Defense — don't know, perhaps present Secretary Lovett would remain as a "hold-over" for many months.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—— Those who favor realignment of parties perceive good prospects whichever candidate wins. If Ike should be victorious, the chances are that he will have polled a very large popular vote in the South, whether he takes many Southern electoral votes or not. This should prompt his Administration to encourage realignment and joint reorganization of the Congress by Republicans and Southern Democrats. If Adlai should win, the coalition of the same two elements would stiffen and work together closely; it would provide the basis for the hope for a "new party" which would inevitably be expressed following a GOP defeat. Conservatives will be in the majority in the next Congress, as they have in the last seven Congresses. Despairing cries that defeat dooms the Republican Party might well be drowned in hailing the birth of a new consolidated "conservative" party. At least, that is how it looks to some observers today.

Rebellion: Our associate, Frank Chodorov, who enjoys the vantage position of a lecture trip in the Middle West, mails us his *obiter dicta* on the coal strike:

The current coal strike is not an effort to compel the mine owners to pay the workers higher wages, but to compel the United States government to permit the owners to pay higher wages, and benefits. It is an act of violence against the Government — and that is rebellion. The strike is in character exactly like an invasion of Washington by an armed force of citizens intent on intimidating the Executive and causing him to alter a decree. His sovereignty is attacked.

If John L. Lewis is successful in this venture, it will be only because his claim to sovereignty is acknowledged by the Executive. He will have achieved the superior position by an act of coercion. On the other hand, to maintain his top position the Executive must use coercive measures of greater potency than that of Mr. Lewis. Will he?

I venture the opinion that in this struggle for sovereignty — or power — Mr. Lewis will win.

Air Power in Korea: Marine Commandant General Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., has stirred up a big rumpus in service circles by attacking the Air Force for failure to stop supplies from coming to the enemy's front lines in the present bitter battles. Major Alexander P. de Seversky, well-known writer on aviation matters, retorts by saying that the Shepherd assault "seems to me not only unwarranted, but close to foul. If allowed to stick, it will tend to discredit air power, with disastrous results for American security." (New York *Journal-American,* October 19, 1952.)

Seversky stresses that bombing of the enemy supply lines cannot be entirely successful while the enemy enjoys unlimited freedom to build up its forces beyond the Yalu River. "The most the air force could do against such handicaps was sharply to reduce the flood of Communist reinforcements and this they certainly have accomplished." The writer on air power then offers the most illuminating simile we have seen to explain this hopeless situation (which was created by State Department policy).

"Suppose your kitchen sink has overflowed and flooded the room. You try to mop up the water on the floor — but don't close the faucet. No matter how hard and well you mop, the water will continue to pour onto the floor. The whole procedure will be exhausting and futile. That, in effect has been the heart-breaking procedure imposed upon our air forces. They are expected to 'mop up' the enemy supply and forces while the 'faucet' — the sources of Communist reinforcement north of the Yalu — remains wide open. Closing off the flow has, unhappily, been precluded by political considerations."

●

From Major Jordan's Diaries: George Racey Jordan, with Richard L. Stokes. New York. Harcourt, Brace and Company. $3.75. Reviewed by Burton Rascoe.

This is an important and appalling contribution to the history of the Great Betrayal. Bits of that history have been coming to us piecemeal over a period of five years, in spite of the most powerful

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organized forces for suppression that money, official position, command over media of expression and the whip of economic and social reprisals can make possible.

The Great Betrayal began with the first honeymoon of Roosevelt and Stalin, which, with Stalin, was a despised and despicable alliance entered into only for money, for advantages and better opportunities to strangle and to kill. Among the first progeny from this misalliance were the fecund and rapidly multiplying Soviet espionage cells in the State Department, known as the Harold Ware and Noel Field "apparatuses".

Major George Racey Jordan supplies much hitherto missing information as to how the espionage activities of traitors in our Government, in defense and industrial plants, at the nuclear fission establishments of Los Alamos, Oak Ridge and under Stagg Field, Chicago, profited.

Tons of secret documents and formulas packed in cheap suitcases and tied with window cord arrived by air and railway at the Army Air Base at Great Falls, Montana, where Major Jordan served as liaison officer with the Russians. From there the stuff was flown by Russian pilots to an Alaskan air base and thence to Moscow.

There was nothing secret (except to the American public and to the watchdogs of Treasury expenditures in the Congress) about most of the stuff, costing the American taxpayer about $9,500,000,000 plus another two billion for technical aid, which was flown from Great Falls. It was "Lend-Lease", the generous bounty of Harry Hopkins, who declared at a rally for Russian aid in Madison Square Garden: "We are determined that nothing shall stop us from sharing with you all that we have and are."

"Lend-Lease", under the law which created it, was limited to supplies directly needed for the successful prosecution of the war. But, as Hopkins was so plaintively to remind Stalin in Moscow in 1945, "We construed the law very liberally in sending foodstuffs and other non-military items to your aid."

It was Hopkins who thus construed the law. He was dictator of "Lend-Lease" as surely as Stalin was the dictator of the uses in Russia to which our "Lend-Lease" supplies were to be put.

Racey Jordan, after his suspicions were aroused over the immense quantities of black suitcases that were going through, began to keep his own records of the airships' manifests. Afterwards he was able to get from the Russians a complete itemized list of the "Lend-Lease" shipments. The list fills fifty pages of his book.

In one suitcase, containing documents from Oak Ridge, filled with symbols of chemical formulas and algebraic calculations, was a note on White House stationery, addressed to A. Mikoyan, one of the three top men of the Kremlin, and a notation, "Currie had a hell of a time getting these away from Groves—H.H."

Groves was General Groves, commander of the Manhattan Project, who was aghast at Jordan's recital of the formulas found in the black bags and of the manifests of "bomb power", uranium nitrate, uranium oxide, cadmium metal, graphite, thorium and other essentials in atomic experiments.

This was an indication to Groves that in spite of the most elaborate security precautions, the Russians had got from treasonable sources in America not only the knowledge of how A-bombs are made, but also the precious materials needed in the making of them — three years before our own first successful test of the bomb.

Jordan tells this appalling story in its fascinating and frightening entirety.

Now, the same persons and the same publications that so eagerly defended Alger Hiss, William Remington, the principals in the Amerasia case et al, have sought to discredit Major Jordan just as they sought to discredit Whittaker Chambers.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 900 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED